

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 09/21/2005

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/670,114	09/24/2003	Akihiko Mochida	17049	7178	
23389 75	590 09/21/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER	
	OTT MURPHY & PI	CZEKAJ,	CZEKAJ, DAVID J		
400 GARDEN SUITE 300	CITY PLAZA		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	Y, NY 11530		2613		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Comment	10/670,114	MOCHIDA ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Dave Czekaj	2613				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	dress			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filled after SIX (5) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 Ju	lv 2005.					
,						
closed in accordance with the practice under E						
Disposition of Claims			•			
4) Claim(s) 4-7 is/are pending in the application.						
,	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	•					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>4-7</u> is/are rejected.	/ <u></u>					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
	·					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form P1	10-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National	Stage			
Attachment(s)	_					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ite	O-152)			

Application/Control Number: 10/670,114 Page 2

Art Unit: 2613

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 4-7 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karasawa (US 5,196,928) in view of Loonen (5255092).

As for claim 4, Karasawa teaches of an image pickup element that constitutes one image-captured surface by arranging a plurality of scanning lines having a first number of pixels (Karasawa: Column 3, Lines 38-42); a drive circuit for outputting to the image pickup element a drive signal with a first frequency for sequentially reading an image-captured signal image- captured on the image pickup surface of the image pickup element for every scanning line (Karasawa: Column 3, Lines 43-45); a line memory having a memory capacity which can store one scanning line of image-captured signals read from the image pickup element (Karasawa: Column 3, Lines 47-65); a writing signal generating circuit for outputting a writing signal with the first frequency to the line memory and for writing the image-captured signal and a reading signal generating circuit for outputting a reading signal with a frequency to the line

memory and for reading image-captured signals stored in one scanning line (Karasawa: Column 3, Lines 47-65); a video signal processing circuit for performing video signal processing on the image-captured signals read with the second frequency from the line memory (Karasawa: Column 3, Lines 43-47). However, Karasawa fails to disclose reading a signal with a second frequency which is higher than the first frequency. Loonen teaches that prior art computing systems cannot accurately adjust a clock frequency (Loonen: column 1, lines 35-55). To help alleviate this problem, Loonen discloses "reading a signal with a second frequency which is higher than the first write frequency" (Loonen: column 3, lines 40-50). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the apparatus disclosed by Karasawa and add the different frequencies taught by Loonen in order to obtain an apparatus that can accurately adjust a clock signal.

As for claim 5, most of the limitations of the claim have been discussed in the above rejection of claim 4. Karasawa also teaches of the video signal processing means has an enlarge/reduce processing function for performing horizontal enlargement or reduction (Karasawa: Column 5, Lines 1-8).

As for claim 7, most of the limitations of the claim have been discussed in the above rejection of claim 4. Karasawa also teaches of adding a second image pickup unit, which shows greater detail than the first but with all the circuitry mentioned above (Karasawa: Column 2, Lines 58-68).

4. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karasawa (US 5.196,928) in view of Loonen (5255092) in further view of Saeger (US 5,287,188).

As for claim 6, most of the limitations of the claim have been discussed in the above rejection of claim 5. Karasawa in view of Loonen teach of superimposing means for superposing an externally input image signal (i.e. TV camera) on an image-captured signal processed in the video signal processing means (Karasawa: Column 4, Lines 48-68 and Column 5, Lines 1-14). Although Karasawa in view of Loonen do not explicitly teach of superimposing position control means for controlling a superimposing position of the superposing means in accordance with an image pickup element selfcontained in the connected image pickup unit, however, Saeger does (Saeger: Column 12. Lines 49-68). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to take the superimposed images described in Karasawa, add the different frequencies taught by Loonen, and give it the added feature of being able to move the images on the screen as taught by Saeger because this would allow the user to arrange the pictures in the best possible way so that comparisons could be done between the two (this movable position is also considered well-known in the art since its use has been available).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dave Czekaj whose telephone number is (571) 272-7327. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9 hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mehrdad Dastouri can be reached on (571) 272-7418. The fax phone

Application/Control Number: 10/670,114 Page 5

Art Unit: 2613

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DJC

PRIMARY EXAMINER